



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Telephone (612)373-3226

AGENDA

All University Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, December 3, 1981
12:30 - 3:00 p.m.
Dale Shephard Room - Coffman Memorial Union

1. Fix agenda
2. Minutes of November 19 (if available)
3. Report of the Chair - oral
4. Report of the Student Chair - oral
5. Committee reports
6. Old Business
7. New Business
 - a. Proposal on improving consulting mechanisms -
Marcia Eaton (enclosure)



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

December 3, 1981

The meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee was convened by Chairman Douglas Pratt at 12:30 p.m., December 3, 1981 at the Campus Club, Coffman Union. Other SCC members present were Marcia Eaton, Virginia Fredricks, John Howe, Marvin Mattson, Paul Quie, Richard Purple, Donald Spring, Patricia Swan, Nancy Brecht, Jim Brewer, T. J. Grbich, Dave Lenander, Richard Linden, Kit Wiseman. Guests were Stacy Milavetz, Maureen Smith, Mary Jane Plunkett.

Agenda-

Additions-

- New Business: 1. Outreach report with comments by Professor Brasted.
2. Library lending policy.

Old Business: John Turner's motion regarding the Health Sciences Vice Presidency.

Minutes of November 19-

Correction - T. J. Grbich should be listed as a guest.
The minutes were approved as corrected.

Report of the Chair-

The Committee on Equal Opportunity for Women has elected co-chairs for the two-quarter interval while Shirley Moore will be on leave. They are Laura Cooper and Sarah Evans.

The Senate Finance Committee and representatives from the Senate Consultative Committee will meet jointly with Vice Presidents Keller, Hasselmo, and French on Wednesday, December 9 at 3:15 p.m. in the Regents Room. They will discuss the criteria that each Vice President uses to rate programs when preparing ongoing plans to be presented to the Regents in January. Also to be discussed are plans for immediate cuts and the possible recovery of some money to a central reserve fund. The Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Consultative Committee will consult regularly with the Budget Executive during January.

Report of Student Chair-

New student representatives were elected to the Board of Regents: Julie Bates, Nancy Christmas, Shawn Mahoney, Rose Johnson.

Committee Reports-

There were no committee reports.

Old Business-

1. Turner Motion -

Copies were distributed of the motion John Turner intends to make on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. It is a four-part resolution regarding the position of Vice President for Health Sciences.

Discussion-

Rick Linden began the discussion by asking why the Health Sciences must have its own Vice President. Professor Quie replied that a special situation arose among university hospitals after World War II in which hospitals expanded greatly in size and complexity. In 1969 a special panel of outside specialists recommended that Health Sciences at the University of Minnesota be administered by its own Vice President and this governance policy was adopted in 1970. Meredith Poppele added that in 1970 the University Senate approved the Vice Presidency of Health Sciences.

Dave Lenander stated that he was now convinced, after initial misgivings, that a Vice Presidency is needed for Health Sciences. He suggested, however, that in the light of criticism about top-heavy administration in the University structure, a general recommendation could be made to cut back on administrators.

Professor Eaton said that undertaking an examination of University structure at this time is not feasible because of so many other pressing concerns. Professor Purple agreed and asked whether it was really the role of the SCC to advise Central Administration about administrative structure. Professor Fredericks agreed that administrative restructuring is a very big job and could not possibly be accomplished by a single resolution. Professor Spring also agreed and said examination of the office would require long term work by a "blue ribbon" committee. He added that President Magrath has already replied to some points in the resolution on the floor of the Senate and these remarks are recorded in the Watson report.

Professor Purple suggested that the SCC reject Mr. Turner's motion on the basis that point one is moot, since the President has made it abundantly clear that the Vice President for Academic Affairs is the chief academic officer of the University under the President; point two is likewise moot; point three unduly restricts the prerogatives of the President; point 4 describes the process which has been followed in the past. Several SCC members believe point two — "The Vice President for Health Sciences reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on academic matters," remains ambiguous in practice. Otherwise there was agreement with Purple's assessment.

Professor Eaton moved the SCC report to the Senate that Mr. Turner's motion was discussed briefly and that the following comments be made: 1. Point one is moot. Point two of the motion is unclear and requires further clarification. 2. Point four may be expected to be the case on the basis of the records of the Senate. 3. Point three unduly restricts the prerogatives of the President. The motion was carried without dissent.

2. Communication improvement - Professor Eaton

Professor Eaton reported that a committee of the Planning Council had distributed a questionnaire to the deans which requested information about faculty/student

consultation in their college. Their responses were the basis for a report on consultation within the colleges of which several copies were distributed by Professor Eaton. Although the report proved to be very interesting, Professor Eaton suggested that a report from faculty is also needed. Professor Swan suggested that the Senate be given responsibility to carry out such an assignment. Kit Wiseman observed that senators may not be familiar with the consultation process within their own college but that this would provide a good opportunity to learn. Professors Spring and Fredericks strongly advised establishing a deadline for the report. Professor Spring also advised the use of Marilee Ward's office. Professor Eaton suggested that the SCC identify one student senator and one faculty senator from each collegiate unit to report to the SCC at the end of January. They would be encouraged to contact Marilee Ward's office.

A motion was made that the Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee and the Student Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee appoint one student senator and one faculty senator to implement (with the help of other senators and Marilee Ward's office) a procedure based on the administration report which would specifically inquire about whether the consultative process for the college usually works as described in the report, whether it worked that way during the last cycle of planning, and whether there is any need for change. The deadline for this report will be January 15, 1981. The motion carried without dissent.

New Business -

1. New library lending code-

Professor Pratt has reported to the Business and Rules Committee. The initial reaction of that committee was that the matter should be routed through the Senate.

A motion was made that Dave Lenander be asked to raise the issue on the floor of the Senate on behalf of the Senate Consultative Committee and make a recommendation for the Library Committee to consider. The motion carried without dissent.

2. Outreach report-

Professor Pratt read a number of Professor Brasted's comments. Since Professor Brasted would not be present to speak on the Senate floor, there was discussion as to how his comments should be presented. A motion was made that Professor Pratt report to the Senate that a subcommittee of the Senate Consultative Committee has reviewed and will continue to review the issues discussed in the Outreach Report and that Professor Brasted gives his general approval to the report, though he does have some serious reservations (especially concerning costs) which have been inserted in the minutes of the Senate Consultative Committee. (See attachment to these minutes) The motion carried without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen Helmstetter

UNIVERSITY POLICY AGENDA 1981-82

The President, upon the recommendation of the University Senate, is called upon to submit an annual policy agenda for the institution. This report seeks to respond to the Senate's request by outlining those major policy issues that, in the President's opinion, warrant particularly close scrutiny during the 1981-82 academic year.

In reviewing the issues that follow, three points should be kept in mind. First, the list of specific items included here is intentionally limited; it attempts to concentrate upon those issues that have systemwide implications and that should receive systemwide attention. Second, not all of the issues contained in this agenda can, will, or even should be resolved during the current academic year. Some of the items simply resist quick and easy solutions and, instead, will demand continuous attention throughout the foreseeable future. Third, the University Senate, both as a body and through its committee structure, will participate in the review and recommendation processes that pertain to the issues outlined below.

1. UNIVERSITY SALARIES

On November 19, the Legislative Commission on Employee Relations approved a 20.3 percent compensation package, including 9.1 percent cash increases for the first year of the biennium, and 8.8 percent for the second year for State University and Community College faculty. Those systems will achieve these figures only through internal retrenchments that they are making. It is anticipated that at the December meeting the Regents will approve a salary and compensation package for University of Minnesota faculty. Our State salary appropriation will be augmented further by 2.16 percent as a result of University reallocation, providing approximate salary increases of 10 percent for 1981-82 plus fringe benefit increases.

The President has conferred with the Senate Consultative Committee, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, and the Senate Finance Committee and they presented their views and recommendations on the distribution of faculty salary increases. Their recommendations will be taken into account in the salary recommendations made to the Regents.

It is currently impossible to determine when the salary adjustments will be reflected in faculty paychecks. The adjustments, however, will be made as quickly as possible and will include a two stage process: increases in monthly checks and single retroactive check back to July 1, 1981.

2. POSSIBLE UNIVERSITY RETRENCHMENT

In late October, the University was asked to prepare plans for budget reductions of \$37 million, \$47 million, and \$57 million over the biennium. Subsequently, the Board of Regents passed a unanimous resolution stating that 1) the proposed reductions would make it impossible for the University to continue serving the State as a major contributor to its economy and to its cultural and intellectual vitality, 2) the University could absorb, despite a negative impact, a reduction of up to \$10 million, and 3) if reductions of \$37 million or more were required, the Regents would have to

declare a state of fiscal exigency, with potential termination of University personnel and students.

A few days ago the Governor recommended 11.8 percent reductions for the University of Minnesota. This level of reduction is regarded by us as disastrous to the University's performance of its mission to the State, and the President and the Budget Executive have been and will continue to be in consultation and communication with the SCC and the Senate Finance Committee to discuss methods for addressing the situation. Periodic reports will also be provided at each of the Senate meetings during the academic year. Whatever programmatic decisions are ultimately made will be made within the University and by its faculty, administrators, and Regents.

3. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

The first cycle of institutional planning will be completed by the beginning of Winter Quarter. The products of that process, which began in the Spring of 1979 include:

- A revised mission statement for the University approved by the Regents in July of 1980.
- An institutional planning statement which suggests broad goals and objectives.
- Planning statements for each college and major support unit suggesting goals, objectives, and priorities over a three to five year period.
- Presidential planning memoranda which specify the President's views regarding unit plans.
- A planning data base which consists of a periodically updated set of historical and projected figures useful for planning and decision making is maintained by the Office of Management Planning and Information Services.
- The development of a general architecture for planning and decision making.
- Advice to the President on selected issues. An administrative working group is preparing a study of communication, computation, and information systems; a preliminary report has been presented to the Senate Consultative Committee and the chairs of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Planning Committee. In addition, a joint study by the Senate and the administration of selected policy questions is under way. (The 1981-82 study will focus on policies which would help facilitate the scholarly activities of the faculty.)

The second cycle of institutional planning will begin in the Spring of 1982 and will include:

- further refinement of an integrated decision cycle emphasizing planning and budgeting in alternate years.
- highlighting selected issues such as outreach, implications of changing patterns of research funding, program duplication, enrollment management, the development of an integrated system of computation, communication, and information technology, an integrated system of unit reviews, the use of incentives in program development, and the development of stronger links between academic planning and support service, and physical facility planning.

We expect the second cycle of institutional planning to build on the first and to improve on it (a) by focusing on selected issues which will be highlighted, (b) by strengthening our ability to analyze external social, economic, and political constraints, and (c) by incorporating resource acquisition and assignment as an explicit part of the planning framework.

4. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Contract discussions among representatives from the University and from the UMDEA, which represents the collective bargaining faculty groups on the Duluth and Waseca Campuses, will continue until there is an agreement upon a final contract. The University's negotiating team has given UMDEA representatives a draft of a complete contract and tentative agreement has been reached on several contract sections. Upon completion of the negotiations, the contract will be voted upon by the Regents and by the faculty represented by the collective bargaining agents.

Faculty on the Twin Cities Campus, with the exception of the faculty in the Law School and the Health Sciences, are currently voting on collective bargaining. That vote will be completed at the end of December.

5. RAJENDER CONSENT DECREE

The Offices of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Administration and Planning, Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, and the University Attorney, will continue to review claims and petitions arising out of the Rajender Consent Decree. The current status of claims and petitions is as follows:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| I. Settled (2), dismissed (14), or withdrawn (6)
(claims and petitions) | 22* |
| II. Trial Completed | 2 |

III. Currently being handled internally	153
A. Under settlement	13
B. Under investigation	138
180 day period expires by 1/1/82	
8 or 138	
180 day period expires after 1/2/82	
123 of 138	
180 day period expires after 3/14/82	
7 of 138	
IV. Currently external to the University	21
A. Internal review completed and claim returned to Special Masters for hearing (One is also still in settlement)	10
B. Claimant has filed notice to proceed (two are also still in settlement; one has been referred to internal tribunal)	11
V. Status of intervenors	5
-- Trial held, findings remanded to Special Masters	1
-- Out of court settlement reached	1
-- Trial scheduled (December 1)	1
-- Awaiting trial	2

* Six of the persons who had petitions dismissed still have claims and are also counted in the claims under investigation. (November 16, 1981)

6. REORGANIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Vice President Keller will undertake a review and reorganization of his office and selected support units that report to his office. Included in the review will be University College, the Center for Educational Development, and University Outreach activities.

7. REVIEWS OF GRADUATE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Food Science | Fluid Mechanics |
| Nutrition | Family Practice |
| Entomology | Family Planning Administration |
| Fisheries | Obstetrics |
| Wildlife | Gynecology |
| History of Medicine | Psychiatry |
| Neurology | Pathobiology |
| Urology | Aeronautical Engineering |
| Therapeutic | Mechanics |

5. There is a hearty endorsement of this recommendation, as noted earlier in recommendation 1, in part because of different meanings of "outreach" to different units.

6. The full report verifies the fact that full inloading would be a very expensive operation. A simpler method of deriving financial statistics would have been to simply consult both CEE and Summer Sessions for their budgets, especially noting the departments with large service courses offered in the summer and evening. One such department alone (not in the survey) for one summer would necessitate new funds of some \$200,000. The number of junior staff (TA's) needed to teach the summer programs in this department could not be assigned from the regularly budgeted academic year staff.

7. The obvious caution in this recommendation is found in the fact that the percentage of faculty perceiving the benefits of inloading is small. The opposite is even more striking, a very small percentage feel that our educational program, overall, would be strengthened.

The full report is impressive and represents a very necessary accumulation of data, not of the "anecdotal" nature inferred in the original "Outreach Report." It is important to remind ourselves that some 41% of the faculty taught no SS classes, 81% taught either non or 1-5 in five years. The remaining 19% are providing a lot of information that may or may not be based on real experiences. The reasonably consistent figure of about 40% with "no response" is more easily understood. It might have been useful to find out how many CEE classes are taught by staff less qualified or with less credentials (PhD or equivalent) than in the day classes. It was interesting to see some of the differences in evaluation by Deans in contrast to Faculty.

FOR THE SENATE MEETING OF DECEMBER 3, 1981

MOTION - *submitted*

Be it resolved that:

1. The Vice President for Academic Affairs is the chief academic officer of the University under the President;
2. The Vice President for Health Sciences reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on academic matters;
3. When a new Vice President for Health Sciences is appointed, this officer shall not be a member of the Budget Executive;
4. Any plans to create a new vice presidency at the University shall be submitted to the Senate for its recommendation before the post is established.

John E. Turner,
CLA Senator

The Senate recommends that:

1. Either an existing Senate committee or a special task force (to be determined by the President and the Senate Consultative Committee in joint discussion) be authorized to study the question of whether there should be a Vice President for the Health Sciences or whether an alternative arrangement should be recommended, and that the committee/task force be requested to report at the spring meeting of the Senate.

2. Until the committee/task force submits its report, the Vice Presidency for the Health Sciences should continue to be regarded as a temporary position, i.e., that for the time being it will retain the provisional status it has had since its creation.

3. If and when a new Vice President for the Health Sciences is appointed, this officer shall not be a member of the Budget Executive.

Respectfully submitted,

John E. Turner

CLA Senator

The issue of whether the Health Sciences should continue to have a separate Vice President is a matter of University-wide concern. When a central administrative post is linked with a specific subject-matter area, educational policy can be affected, especially when the occupant of the office is a member of the Budget Executive. The existence of the office also tends to undercut the authority of the Academic Vice President, making more difficult the application of uniform standards throughout the University, especially in personnel matters.

The office of the Vice President for the Health Sciences was formed by the Board of Regents in the early 1970s in order to deal with the problems of expansion in that field. The Regents, however, considered the arrangement to be temporary, and to the best of my knowledge the faculty never really discussed the issue at that time.

The announcement of Dr. French's resignation came during the summer, and steps were taken immediately to set up a search committee which commenced its work early in the autumn. The Consultative Committee gathered some documents during the summer and it indicated that a few faculty members were raising questions about the search, but it apparently made no recommendations. This is the first opportunity available to the faculty to discuss the issue.

Even if the Vice Presidency for the Health Sciences had not initially been viewed as a temporary arrangement, the time to discuss the issue of continuance is now, when the position is entering a new phase. In recent planning efforts, which have been prompted by the prospect of austere budgets, the faculty have been called upon to examine virtually all of the University's organizational patterns and programs. They ought to be interested in sponsoring a study of this unique arrangement in the Health Sciences in order to determine the rationale for continuing the office and to see how it has worked out, how it has affected educational policies, and how it compares with alternative organizational forms.

If a new Vice President for the Health Sciences is appointed without having the faculty consider whether a temporary arrangement should be made permanent, the Vice Presidency is likely to become permanent by default. This ought not to happen in an institution that is committed to long-range planning through faculty consultation.

It may be that the faculty, after careful study and discussion, will agree that the present arrangement for the Health Sciences is the most desirable pattern and should be continued indefinitely. But we shall not know the position of the faculty on this issue unless they have an opportunity to study and consider the matter.

It is recognized that the University is currently facing difficult problems of another sort and that the deliberations of the search committee have already begun. For these reasons, this motion is being made with reluctance. Since the attention of the faculty is being drawn to an issue on which a decision was made before the academic year began, a compromise solution in the form of the above motion is being offered. The motion will not nullify the work of the search committee and it will still enable

the concerns that the issue raises.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

DEC 16 1981

December 15, 1981

Professor Douglas Pratt, Chairman
Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
St. Paul Campus

Dear Doug:

I have now officially received from Marilee Ward the resolution dealing with the Vice Presidency for Health Sciences passed by the University Senate at the December 3 meeting, and believe it is appropriate and fair for me to communicate my reactions and response.

As you know, the resolution, which passed on a 71 to 50 vote, had four elements. The first, addressing the subject of the Vice President for Academic Affairs as the Chief Academic Officer, and the fourth, with regard to the creation of new Vice Presidencies and the role of the Senate in such decisions, are essentially non-controversial and not currently relevant. In my Administration, the Vice President for Academic Affairs serves as the Chief Academic Officer after me; this is manifest in all kinds of ways that I do not believe need to be outlined here. Some years ago, I decided to reject a proposal for a seventh Vice Presidency, and I have no plans or thoughts regarding any such position; that is a subject my successor or successors can address.

The second and third points of the resolution are more difficult, because they, to a considerable extent, instruct me as to how to work administratively with my colleagues. In fact, all Vice Presidents at the University of Minnesota report directly to me, and I work intimately and directly with each one of them and with all of them as a team. I do not plan to change this. I have already indicated that on ultimate personnel (promotion and tenure) recommendations, all of them will flow through the Vice President for Academic Affairs who will give me the benefit of his recommendation and judgment on all of these matters -- after, of course, close and careful consultation with the Vice President for Health Sciences and other Vice Presidents as appropriate in terms of their areas of responsibility. (There are, for example, academic personnel recommendations that flow out of the Vice President for Student Affairs.)

The Budget Executive is an administrative creation, reflecting my management procedures for the University of Minnesota. It is chaired and led, at my request, by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, which is consistent with the leading role of that office and individual. The Budget Executive is, in effect, a committee advisory to me, and I use it in this fashion. For instance, because planning is so crucial today and must be linked to budgetary issues, I recently concluded (and this is quite unrelated to

Professor Douglas Pratt, Chairman
Senate Consultative Committee
December 15, 1981

the Senate resolution) that the Vice President for Administration and Planning, Dr. Nils Hasselmo, should become a member of the Budget Executive. Similarly, I have believed and continue to believe that it is useful for the Vice President for Health Sciences to be directly involved with that internal administrative committee.

Finally, I would like to make a general observation. A careful reading of the letter and the spirit of the Watson Committee Report indicates that in recent years relationships involving the Vice President for Academic Affairs have been very substantially clarified, and that virtually all of the specific and general recommendations of that Committee's Report have been implemented both by Senate action and by my action and decisions. My Administration has consistently upheld academic values and the integrity of the basic academic processes at the University of Minnesota, and the strong and leading role of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is very clearly manifest, a development that has been easier to accomplish in the past couple of years with the appointment of a strong, decisive, and forceful person in that role.

All of us, I am sure, appreciate the various tensions and diverse points of view that inevitably operate within such a large University. I recognize these, but must also have a margin of executive discretion in which to manage and try to provide leadership. This is especially true today when we face an enormous budget crisis. There is a need for as much unity and harmony as possible, and it is important to allow the University's Chief Executive Officer some reasonable authority appropriate to the great responsibilities that face me and the other executive officers of this University.

Cordially,



C. Peter Magrath
President

CPM:kb

cc: University Vice Presidents
Professor Rick Purple, Vice Chair, University Senate

11/24/81

To: SCC members
From: Marcia Eaton
Re: Collegiate unit consultation

We all agreed that we need to have consultation procedures in place. The following proposal is intended as a basis for discussion.

The SCC shall appoint one faculty senator and one student senator from each collegiate unit electing senators to report on the nature of the consulting process within their unit. This report should answer the following questions:

1. a. Does the unit have a constitution which mandates consultation within the unit? If so, describe.
b. Are there other consultative committees, deans' advisory committees, etc.?
c. Are the groups described under a) and b) currently functioning?
2. How have faculty and students participated in retrenchment and reallocation decisions at the collegiate level in the past? Is the same sort of participation expected in future retrenchment and reallocation decisions?

In preparing this report to SCC, the two appointed senators should feel free to enlist the help of other senators or non-senators within their unit.

:mbp



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Telephone (612)373-3226
December 9, 1981

To:

From: Douglas Pratt, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee

Re: Unit consultation

The Senate Consultative Committee is deeply concerned that genuine consultation take place at several levels throughout the University. They are undertaking a brief study to assess the degree of collegiate consultation in practice. To gather opinion and information, the committee has directed me to request of one faculty senator from each collegiate unit an assessment of that unit's internal consultation policies and procedures. The chair of the student SCC has been directed to do the same with student senators. I would appreciate your written response no later than January 15.

Enclosed is a completed questionnaire which your unit submitted to the Planning Council in mid-1979. The questionnaire was designed by a subcommittee of the Planning Council to provide, among other purposes, a record of how planning was being carried out. I would like you to examine that report and, through any means you find expedient, assess and comment upon:

- (a) Whether planning/consulting has generally worked this way in your collegiate unit;
- (b) Whether it worked this way for the 1981 cycle of establishing "program priorities;" (As you are probably aware, Vice President Keller has met individually with all deans and required them to prioritize their unit's programs for purposes of the next biennial request planning, aiming at a 5% contraction in the whole: did consultation for this planning follow the description in the questionnaire?)
- (c) What manner of consultation actually has taken place, if it has been other than that described in the questionnaire responses;
- (d) Whether you see any need for change in you unit's planning/consulting practices.

If you are in a large unit and wish to formally survey the unit's senators, and if your department's clerical staff is too busy to assist, the SCC office can type, copy and mail for you.

If for any reason you expect to be unable to report back to the SCC within the time allowed, would you please, as soon as possible, pass the assignment on to another senator in your unit, or return the enclosed report to us so that we can ask another senator.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

:mbp

Enc.

12/3/81

Background on library lending policy issue.

1. From the minutes of the Senate Library Committee, May 22, 1981:

"3. Proposed University of Minnesota-Twin Cities Campus Libraries Lending Policy. Mr. Smith highlighted the changes between the old and new lending codes. (Copies of both codes were distributed to the committee before the meeting date.) The new code is more generalized, giving flexibility to individual units in areas such as loan periods and required forms of borrower identification. Mr. Smith then asked the committee for its suggestions, and the committee discussed how fines are set, what sanctions will be imposed and how they will be implemented, and cancellation of fines under extraordinary circumstances. A motion was made, seconded, and passed that the Senate Library Committee recommend the proposed University of Minnesota-Twin Cities Campus Lending Policy be amended as follows:

"a. Section IV-F. This sentence should be added: 'Individual library units will be responsible for establishing their fine schedules.'

"b. Section IV-G-3. Add the following at the end of the sentence: '...and other reasonable sanctions.'

The committee then approved the proposed library code, with the amendments set forth above. Mr. Smith added that if the committee desires, some of the library units could report on how the code is being implemented at one of the committee's upcoming meetings. The new lending code still needs the Regents' approval and this will determine how soon such a report could be presented."

2. From the Senate Library Committee's annual report, 1980-81:

"...On motion of the committee, the Senate adopted a resolution providing for the suspension of privileges of faculty members failing to respond to a second recall notice.

"...A new lending code was presented to the committee for its advice and recommendations. With a few suggested revisions, the committee recommended adoption of the new code."

3. From the minutes of the Senate, December 4, 1980:

"VIII. SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE - Library Recall Privilege Forfeiture (5 minutes)

Motion: That the Senate approve a policy that a member of the Twin Cities campus faculty not responding to a second recall notice will lose the privilege of recalling library materials held by other patrons until that faculty member returns the recalled material. Warning of potential loss of recall privileges would be contained in the second recall notice."

(Comment followed.) Motion approved by Senate.

To: Senate Consultative Committee

From: Bob Brasted

Date: November 30, 1981

Subject: Comments on "Inloading" report and SCEP's motion to the Senate
(references are to SCEP's recommendations, agenda item V
for December 3 Senate meeting)

I have had a chance to review (with not too much depth) the major report and have spent some time with the report in the Agenda (as well as a copy sent to me earlier by Stan Lehmborg). The first draft of the original "Outreach" report came through SCEP when I was chair and I had a couple of dozen issues that I felt needed clarification. Below are comments on each of SCEP's present recommendations:

1. It is difficult not to strongly endorse our commitment to Outreach, recognizing that it (the term "Outreach") means different things to different segments of the University. Any effort on the part of the administration to establish uniform criteria or operational principles should keep these differences in mind.
2. The integration concept is an important issue when evening and summer programs are considered. The quality of the three offerings should be the same. The temptation to assign full teaching responsibilities (lecture and administration of courses) to persons without the full qualifications expected of a teacher should be resisted.
3. There are some major "connections" between outreach and inloading, the first and foremost being "money." It is this factor which the 1978-79 SCEP response to the original report addressed. Recommendation 4 shows concern for this factor. The original report certainly did not separate the issues. The obvious question is--"What will be the manner in which the issues are either brought back into focus, or is the present set of recommendations considered to be a sufficient solution?"
4. This recommendation is essentially in agreement with the results of the questionnaire. It would seem that certain departments, and perhaps colleges, are satisfied with distribution of course assignments and teaching responsibilities over the full calendar year as evening programs so that supplements to income are not important issues.